# Traditions of popular education

Flowers, Rick

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

**Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:**
W. Bertelsmann Verlag

**Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:**
Flowers, R. (2009). Traditions of popular education. *REPORT - Zeitschrift für Weiterbildungsforschung*, *32*(2), 9-22. https://doi.org/10.3278/REP0902W009


# Traditions of Popular Education

**von:** Flowers, Rick

**DOI:** 10.3278/REP0902W009

**aus:** **REPORT - Zeitschrift für Weiterbildungsforschung 02/2009**

Erscheinungsjahr: 2009
Seiten 9 - 22

Popular education is a term which has been used for a considerable time. At the outset, however, it should be pointed out that there are multiple perspectives, but they do not "speak" much to each other. There is a tendency to define popular education in narrow and formulaic terms, according to which tradition one is drawing on. I counter this by discussing four traditions and attempt to distil common features across the multiplicity.

Rick Flowers

# Traditions of Popular Education

*Popular education is a term which has been used for a considerable time. At the outset, however, it should be pointed out that there are multiple perspectives, but they do not "speak" much to each other. There is a tendency to define popular education in narrow and formulaic terms, according to which tradition one is drawing on. I counter this by discussing four traditions and attempt to distil common features across the multiplicity.*



## 1. Going beyond Freiran perspectives

Crowther, Martin and Shaw (cf. 1999, 20) say that the term "popular education", has come to be associated with relatively recent developments in Latin America. Recent North American texts present popular education as a field of practice that was first developed through the work of the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire during the 1960s and 1970s. Thus the term "popular education" is approximately 40 years old and characterises a set of principles that many educators share. Rick Arnold and Bev Burke et al. have written several handbooks on popular education (cf. 1983a, 1983b, 1991) which have enjoyed extensive circulation and likewise convey this understanding. They suggest the term has come into currency because it is "a translation of the Spanish *educacion popular* (…); those of us influenced by Latin American educators use the terms interchangeably" (1991, 5).

The above assertions are widely held by Anglo-American adult educators but are misleading. Freire did not pioneer popular education and nor is it exclusively a Latin American tradition. I confess that I associated popular education exclusively with Latin American traditions up until 1999. It was not until Lori Beckett, a colleague at the University of Technology, Sydney showed me a book by Harold Silver (cf. 1965) with the title *Concept of Popular Education: A study of ideas and social movements in the early nineteenth century* that I began learning about other traditions of popular education. Beckett, a school-based education academic, readily related to Silver and the associated body of literature about efforts to establish more educational opportunities for working class peoples. In this paper I seek to address this narrow understanding by describing and discussing both European and historical traditions.

## 2. Multiple traditions

In 1858 the British parliament appointed a royal commission to

> inquire into the present state of popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people (Skeats 1861, III).

Skeats and the members of parliament, therefore, used the term popular education. Historians interested in the struggles to provide education for the masses and working classes continue to employ the term.

Another tradition that explicitly names itself as popular education is located in Sweden. I asked Kjell Rubenson and Staffan Larson who have both been convenors of a national research network of popular educators in Sweden why they choose to use the term popular education as opposed to community education in their English-language publications. I suggested that the term community education might be more readily understood by English-speaking educators because it has more currency than popular education. They explained that the study circles and folk high schools of Sweden were not neutral community education providers but were developed, and are maintained, by social and political movements – the unions, churches, environmentalists and teetotallers to name a few – and are concerned with social change (cf. Larsson 2000, Arvidsson 1989, Sjunnesson 1998). In this respect, they argue that the term popular education is more accurate.

Traditions of popular education can also be found in other parts of the world, for example in the Philippines (cf. Wagner 1998, Guevara 2002) and South Africa (cf. von Kotze 1996, Walters 1988 and 1996).

In this paper I discuss four of these traditions of popular education:

- Working-class education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,
- progressive and radical education,
- adult education for democracy in the early twentieth century,
- Freire and his "pedagogy of the oppressed".

The term popular education conveys what each body of literature has in common: a concern for an education that serves the interests of "ordinary" people, as perceived by "ordinary" people. There is an assumption of a conflict between the interests of big business groups, particular political parties and ruling classes on the one hand and the interests of ordinary people and grassroots community groups on the other. The notion of "popular" refers less to the idea of education *for* the people, since conservatives, liberals and radicals alike are interested in education *for* the people and more to the idea of education *by* the people and *with* the people. With the prevalence of top-down forms and traditions of education, the idea of education *by* people and *with* people takes on significant meaning.

## 3. Working-class education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

One body of literature that employs the term "popular education" arises from the struggles of working class people in Europe and North America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to develop education that was controlled by and for them. The principles and practices of popular education, if not always the term itself, have been in existence for more than two centuries. In the eighteenth century working class people in English-speaking countries did not have the right to formal education and some educators and members of the aristocracy seriously argued that education would confuse and agitate working people. Some authorities conceded that education for poor or working people might be useful so long as it was devoted only to basic skills development.

> Among outright opponents of the idea of charity schools was Bernard de Mandeville, author of the *Fable of the Bees*, which included in its 2nd edition in 1723 an "Essay on Charity and Charity-Schools". (...) the points he made are that (a) the poor do not need any education; (b) if they have learning, they become too proud to work; (c) education makes servants claim higher wages while at the same time they do not want to do servile work; (d) though it might be reasonable to teach reading, the teaching of writing cannot possibly be justified (Neuburg 1971, 3).

Antagonism to education for the poor persisted into the nineteenth century. Davies Giddy, Member of Parliament in a British House of Commons debate in 1807, said:

> Giving education to the labouring classes of the poor (...) would be prejudicial to their morals and happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life, instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments. Instead of teaching them subordination, it would render them fractious and refractory (ibid., 4).

With these sorts of views prevalent, support for the expansion of education opportunities for the majority of the population – that is, the working and peasant classes – was scant and scattered (cf. Johnson 1988, Silver 1965) and "extensive" education for the working "masses" was only introduced after the Reform Acts and Education Acts in the second half of the nineteenth century (cf. Johnson 1988, 14). The State provided scant education for the poor and working classes right up to 1870 (cf. Hogg/Tyson 1969, 7).

Garfit suggests that popular education began with the schools. They produced a class of new readers and that in turn gave impetus to popular education for adults. But:

> It was not an easy thing for all men to embrace popular education (…) They were willing that the poor should learn to read, but did not see the necessity of their being taught to think, and so when the new school (…) was erected (…) they began to fear that they were going too far (1862, 16).

Efforts to establish and expand education for the "people" met with fierce resistance. The Mechanics Institutes were established for the purpose of "the diffusion of science among the working classes" (Brougham 1825, in Silver 1965, 210), yet were seen by some as revolutionary. An article in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (cf. 1825), for instance, asserted that the Mechanics Institute movement was:

> (…) calculated to take the working classes from the guidance of their superiors (…) to give a stimulus to those abominable publications which have so long abounded, and fill the hands of the mechanics with them; to make these mechanics the corruptors and petty demagogues of the working orders generally, to dissolve the bonds between the rich and poor, create insubordination, and foment those animosities which unfortunately prevail so much already between servants and masters (Silver 1965, 213–214).

Silver (cf. 1965), Neuburg (cf. 1971) and Johnson (cf. 1988) argue that, despite this kind of tirade, much of the new education, particularly that of the Mechanics Institutes, was quite conservative. It might be aimed at the working classes, who up till then, had been excluded, but it sought to teach them knowledge and skills that "would produce a more self-reliant, economically viable worker, capable of living diligently within the status quo" (Silver 1965, 236).

It did not foster learning that questioned the status quo. According to Silver (cf. 1965), an underlying assumption of some of the "popular education thinkers" was that poverty was inevitable. In fact, the constitution of many Mechanics Institutes forbade discussions about politics at a time in the 1830s and 1840s "when agitation for political and social reform was central to the preoccupations of working men" (ibid., 222).

Here we see an ambiguity in the history of popular education that continues to this day. There were then, as there are today, concerted efforts to make education more accessible to groups who, historically, had been excluded. The people engaged in these efforts believed that they were shifting education from an elitist to a popular form. Yet, in many cases, education continued to be controlled by elitist interests and was simply being made more accessible.

> The outcome, *un*popular education, has been a gift to those social conservatives who never wanted popular education anyway, but only, at most, a pacified working class (Johnson 1988, 17).

What is truly "popular education"? Silver (cf. 1965, 236) distinguishes between "popular" education that "aimed to produce a specific kind of man for a specific kind

of role" from "popular" education that encouraged people to oppose and imagine alternatives to the status quo. That second type of popular education invariably, according to Silver, leads to participation in social action. Johnson (cf. 1988) distinguishes between popular education concerned with "useful knowledge" as opposed to "*really* useful knowledge". Useful knowledge serves the interests of others, in most cases employers, and is often concerned with individual advancement. *Really useful* knowledge may be oppositional and supports independent, alternative analyses and collective actions.

## 4. Progressive and radical education

Progressive and radical education literature describes the efforts, from the late nineteenth century on, of educators who have sought to develop alternatives to dominant and authoritarian forms of education and help working class and community groups in working towards self-determination. Progressive educators believed in education for freedom "rather than restraint in infancy" (Stewart 1972, 466). This translated into a rejection of overly planned curriculum.



> For the bulk of the ordinary people education was pre-eminently concerned with intellectual, moral, and spiritual training, with pre-meditated and selected goals and practices, with curricula, subjects, and explicit methods, with teachers teaching and pupils learning, with lessons understood and examinations passed. Progressive educators were committed to something very different (ibid., 468).

Indeed progressive and radical educators sought to change prescriptive curriculum and teaching practices. In 1908 in Germany, progressive educators founded a League for School Reform to gain freedom from "prescribed lesson plans and minute regulations of the school bureaucracy" (Lamberti 2000, 45). Ernst Weber in an address to that League asserted:

> Whoever believes that a future generation can be educated to be free and independent by such regimented teachers, by anxious and subaltern officials, for whom any free decision within their profession is made impossible, is entirely mistaken (quoted in ibid., 45).

Related to this tradition of "freedom" in education is the perspective which places value on learning about human relationships rather than cognitive and functional knowledge. Progressive educators sought to value human relationships as much as, if not more than, academic success.

A number of features in progressive education can also be found in popular education theory and practice. For example, the idea that learners should be regarded as subjects rather than objects of change advocated by Rousseau in the eighteenth century is central to Paulo Freire's theorising in the 1970s. The notions of not be-

ing a teacher; of peer learning; of project based learning versus fixed curriculum; of experience-based learning; and of a democratic or participatory way of working are all features of popular education practice in modern settings. They were features advocated by English progressive educators in the late eighteenth century. According to Stewart (cf. 1972), David Williams working in the period 1830 to 1840 was the first British educator to apply the following ideas in a school setting.

Experience-based learning:

> For Williams "education became a process that began with the pupil's own situation, and the function of a tutor was not to impose principles by authority but to bring about situations in which the child could learn by means of his own experience. Received ideas, either from books or from the teacher, interfered with this process" (Stewart 1972, 24–25).

Democratic and participatory learning:

> Perhaps the most revolutionary step was William's abdication of the traditional role of teacher. (...) he gradually gave up his position as a teacher and became a member of every class, receiving instruction in common with pupils (ibid., 26).

Peer learning:

> Williams put a boy who could not read under the care and tuition of another boy (...) reciprocal assistance (as he called it) (ibid., 27).

Project-based learning:

> William's academy did not adhere to the common practice of having a fixed curriculum, with regular lessons at particular times of the day. In some ways Williams anticipated twentieth century practice in the integration of subjects and the introduction of what is now called the project method (ibid., 29).

Progressive and radical educators disagree with the idea that they have a responsibility to mould and shape people, an idea which Simon (cf. 1972, 17) argues was inspired by religious righteousness and a belief dominant in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that education must serve the interests of the existing ruling classes. Radical and progressive traditions believed in facilitators rather than "teachers".

> In *Chartism* (1840) William Lovett (...) sees the task of the teacher not as that of imposing knowledge and habits on the children, but of assisting them to acquire knowledge and habits through their own activity, so exercising their reason and moral judgement that they come to understand for themselves and know aright (ibid., 17).

## 5. Adult education for democracy in the early twentieth century

There is a body of literature about adult education for democracy in the early twentieth century comparable in size to the body of literature about popular education in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Two leading North American adult education scholars of the time – Ruth Kotinsky (cf. 1933) and Eduard Lindeman (cf. 1926) – made major contributions to the literature. Both shared an interest in education which strengthens the capacities of people to participate in decision-making. For Kotinsky the role of adult education in her book

> *Adult Education and the Social Scene* (1933) was to identify social problems and deal with them in such ways as to make the participants intelligent and responsible planners, rather than merely drifters and sufferers, or ruthless schemers for personal advantage (Heaney 1996, 3).

Both Lindeman and Kotinsky were writing at a time when the state of democracy in Europe was fragile, and they were concerned with strengthening the capacities of people in grassroots community groups to build democracy. In disadvantaged communities in Australia the state of democracy is fragile. For example, the capacity of tenants in many Australian public housing estates to actively participate in community renewal and planning initiatives is limited. When community workers help tenants learn to exercise leadership in housing estate management and community planning they are strengthening grassroots democracy. Strengthening the capacity of people, particularly those from poor and vulnerable groups, to participate in decisions about planning their community's future is at the heart of popular education. Heaney (cf. 1996) argues that in the 1920s and 1930s "front line, grass roots educators of adults" (8) – people concerned with promoting democracy – were at the forefront of the North American adult education movement but that they have since been subsumed or dominated by vocational and organisational educators.

Kotinsky was critical that American adult educators were focusing more on vocational training and less on the educational dimension of community development. In concluding a discussion of the educational role of "the family welfare agency, the medical profession, the church, service clubs, patriotic societies and the like" (1933, 84) she argued against narrow skills training and proposed that the role of the adult educator was to help community workers better understand and promote the educational dimension of their practice.

> One function for a distinct and conscious adult education movement lies in (…) making organized agencies conscious of their educational responsibilities (…) making the adult public more educable through dealing with it educatively, by making education more consciously an end in view (1933, 109–111).

The following quote by Lindemann mirror Kotinsky's vision for an adult education that goes beyond training and is concerned with building a better social order.

> From many quarters comes the call to a new kind of education with its initial assumption affirming that education is life (…) education conceived as a process coterminous with life revolves about non-vocational ideals. In this world of specialists everyone will of necessity learn to do his work. (…) but adult education more accurately defined begins where vocational education leaves off (1926, 4–5).

The type of adult education for democracy that Lindeman and Kotinsky advocated was not merely formal textbook instruction about governance and citizenship. They were more interested in supporting education for community action. Lindeman, for example, highlighted the importance of community action groups as sites of learning for democracy.

> To combat the danger of (…) dictatorship and violence (…) so rife in the 1930s in Germany, Spain and Italy (...) a nation's citizens must be politically sophisticated and used to participating in democratic groups. Since adult learning groups were of this nature they were a crucial training ground for democratic participation (…). Lindeman declared that the participation of citizens in informed social action was the hallmark of a democratic society (Brookfield 1987, 137).

By highlighting education *for* community action versus education *about* democracy Lindeman and Kotinsky are signalling their belief that education should not merely be about equipping people with skills and knowledge to participate more effectively in community affairs, but that education should be about helping people plan and bring about social change.

## 6. Freire and pedagogy for the oppressed

In the early 1960s in Brazil Paulo Freire developed an innovative approach to literacy education. He worked with rural peasants and urban slum dwellers and believed that learning literacy for oppressed people like these should mean much more than simply learning to read and write. Freire argued that educators should help people analyse their situation, and saw literacy as part of the process of engaging in this analysis. As people came to know their world, so they could act on it in order to change it. Freire aimed to shift his learners from passivity to a critical and active awareness and he used the term "conscientisation" to describe this type of transformation.

Freire has had an enormous influence on the practices and theories of educators who work with people who are poor, oppressed and exploited. His influence has been so significant that many practitioners and writers attribute popular education to Freire. An extensive body of literature has arisen devoted to a discussion of his ideas and of how they have been applied.

Freire argues that the content of education should draw on the experiences of the people. This means avoiding standardised curricula but using local knowledge and issues as the basis of educational initiatives.

Freire gave currency to the notion of cultural action and argued that a main educational challenge is to shift people from seeing themselves as recipients of culture to seeing themselves as makers of culture. People who have experienced social exclusion, poverty, discrimination, and alienation in formal education will often have a negative assessment of their capacity to influence change. They will see themselves as objects of, rather than subjects in, history. Freire identified "generative themes" in the discourse of his learners and developed materials to trigger discussion and analysis of these themes. In the case of his own early practice, he commissioned artists to produce series of pictures evoking themes which he and his team of educators used in order to provoke dialogue.

In my experience, many adult educators do want to plan and facilitate learning that begins with the experience of the people they are working with but do not know how. Freire drew on the skills of artists. Who better to depict and reflect back issues and themes that arise from people's experiences? Art generated from contextually specific themes can be used by skilled facilitators to create a dialogic learning experience very different from didactic instruction. There are now popular education handbooks which describe creative ways to use various forms of art to encourage participants to reflect on their own experiences, engage in dialogue and decide on action (e.g. Arnold/Burke 1983a, 1983b and 1991).

Freire's pedagogy has influenced a body of practice called community cultural development which constituted one of the major research focii of the Centre for Popular Education at the University of Technology, Sydney. The Centre was commissioned by several agencies to study the work of various arts groups and artists engaged in youth and community development projects. These have included theatre companies, visual artists, circus performers, writers and dancers. In all the projects the arts workers have sought to support people in poor and disadvantaged communities to research problems, devise solutions and act, perform, exhibit or publish. Together with youth and community workers they have planned and facilitated collaborative art-making. These types of community cultural development project represent a translation of cultural action. Arts and community workers are helping people engage in struggle and make culture.

## 7. Common features of popular education

Richard Johnson defines popular education as that which "means starting from the problems, experiences and social position of excluded majorities, from the position of the working people, women and black people" (cf. Deem 1993, 235).

All four bodies of literature outlined above have in common a concern with helping excluded people exercise more leadership. This is underpinned by a belief that

grassroots community people should be leaders in deciding what changes are needed in their own communities. Popular education is concerned with strengthening pluralist and participatory democracies.

Most of the popular education literature relates to educational initiatives with the poor and oppressed but the pedagogical processes can be used in other contexts – for example, raising the general public's awareness about environmental concerns. There might be differences in degree but the processes and principles of popular education are theoretically applicable in any context. Indeed some have been taken over and used, perhaps in corrupt forms, in human resource development. Photo kits ostensibly based on Freiran ideas and practice, for example, are sometimes used in management training contexts to evoke emotional responses as opposed to dialogic analysis.

For those advocating or drawing on forms and traditions of popular education there is, however, a two-fold problem. Firstly, "education" has a marginal status. Activists - be they working with young people, in the health sector, in environmental advocacy or in community cultural development – often do not perceive their work as "educational". Many who are engaged in environmental advocacy and development work are more interested in marketing, public relations or direct action (see paper in this journal edition by Guevara, Flowers and Whelan). Many community cultural development workers are more interested in artistic and community development outcomes and see the idea of supporting learning about "community" and culture as separate and less important. In health promotion there is ongoing contestation between a dominant tradition of service delivery and mass-communication activities and a subordinate tradition of community education and community development.

The second element to this problem is that the term "educational" is widely understood as meaning teaching, rather than the facilitation of learning. School teachers can reinforce this understanding by equating education with teaching and labelling what happens outside schools as unimportant.

Popular education can contribute to the efforts of those engaged in helping "ordinary" people have more power and opportunity - whether these efforts are called capacity building or building social capital. At the heart of popular education theory and practice lies the challenge of helping people come to know, understand, and tell their stories and those of others. This translates necessarily into education which is learner-centered rather than didactic; which builds on the issues and experiences of the learners rather than materials designated by teachers, experts and authorities; which helps people understand their situation; and which helps them act strategically. Story-making and story-telling is part of the practice of cultural action whose aim is to move people from the notion that they are merely consumers, audience members, participants, and objects to the notion that they are "shakers and movers", the makers and performers of history and culture.

There are, however, forces that can take the edge off popular education work. These can be found, for example, in the current discourses on social capital and com-

munity building. At first glance these discourses seem in accord with popular education because they focus on interaction, active participation, people talking up for themselves, local solutions to local problems, and so on. Here, for example, is a policy statement about neighbourhood renewal from the Victorian government in Australia.

> To narrow the gap between the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Victoria and the rest of the State by working with local communities and business providing services. Neighbourhood renewal empowers local communities to shape their own futures. The initiative builds on the strengths of each community and enhances local skills, capacity and leadership (Community Builders Unit, Premiers Department 2002).

But what is often missing is a concern with social and material change and with the development of a critical consciousness. It is one thing to help people create and tell stories, but another to help them understand social and political structures and to act strategically to change those structures. The discourses of social capital and community building are located in a humanist framework and good practice is often judged by the extent to which people interact.

Popular education practice in the Freiran or radical and progressive education sense, however:

- goes beyond responding to people's needs and helps people assert their rights,
- does more than promote active participation. It fosters robust debate, encourages questioning, fosters a sense of indignation and anger, and at times supports confrontation,
- does more than help people feel more informed, responsible and self-reliant. It helps people to take action and actively pursue alternative visions for the future,
- helps people not just feel empowered but actually strive for *more* power.

The link between the terms "popular" and "culture" is a longstanding one.

> The idea of "popular culture" makes its appearance in the late eighteenth century as opposed to "learned culture" first formulated by the German writer J.G. Herder. The "popular" here was discovered by the intellectual upper classes for whom it indicated everything they thought they were not: the "other" of the "sophisticated, natural, simple, instinctive, irrational and rooted in the local soil" (Burke 1981, quoted in Steele 1999, 97).

Traditions of popular education recognise and value this kind of culture. Popular education is not simply about making education more accessible to grassroots people. It is about designing education so that the knowledge, values and perspectives of grassroots people is privileged and shapes the curriculum. We should continually remind ourselves how education privileges the interests and knowledge of certain groups of people at the expense of others. Neuburg (cf. 1971) and Silver (cf. 1965) have writ-

ten about how dominant educational discourses in eighteenth and nineteenth century England repressed "popular" forms of knowledge. E. P. Thompson argued that the nature of much formal education in nineteenth century England actively excluded working class perspectives. He said that education too often entailed a denial of the validity of the life experiences of the learners "as expressed in the uncouth dialect or in traditional cultural forms" (Thompson 1968, 312).

We can see popular education in opposition to dominant forms and traditions of education. Several writers comment that in the second half of the twentieth century education became predominately technicist and concerned with vocational competencies. Heaney writes:

> The subordination of education to the workplace and learning to the development of job-related "competencies" has privileged instrumental knowledge and the techniques by which such knowledge is transmitted (Heaney 1996, 7).

Beder talks of a new understanding of adult education in which

1. Critical understanding, central to Lindeman's understanding of adult education, was replaced by developing skills.
2. The remnants of humanist concern found in Knowles' conceptualisation of andragogy were replaced by the adult learner as consumer.
3. Adult education became systematized and institutionalized – in a word it was reduced to a form of schooling (ibid., 109).

I conclude this article, therefore with the following table in which I place the commonly accepted assumptions about popular education against those of the dominant or traditional approaches to education.

| POPULAR | DOMINANT/TRADITIONAL |
|---|---|
| Learning in action | Learning through absorption |
| Bottom-up, negotiated and inclusive | Top-down, professionalising and exclusive |
| Problem solving and action | Pre-determined institutional and national goals |
| Education for social capital | Human capital development |
| Learning to conspire | Learning to be inspired |
| Education to champion rights | Education to meet needs |
| Education for resisting hegemonic ways of thinking | Education for conforming with hegemonic ways of thinking |
| Education to strengthen the capacity of grassroots leaders | Education to strengthen the capacity of elite leaders |
| Education for community leadership | Education for individual leadership |
| Education for social change | Education for individual change |

| POPULAR | DOMINANT/TRADITIONAL |
|---|---|
| Education for powerless groups | Education on merit |
| Education for the common good | Education for private good |
| Education to support self-help initiatives | Education to help organisations manage employees |
| Mass education | Education as access to privilege |
| Education as the great equaliser | Education as the great selector |
| Education as political and social action | Education as methodology |
| Education for community development and empowerment | Education for individual achievement and empowerment |
| Education as passion and commitment | Education as technique |
| Education for community and nation | Education for good citizenship |
| Education for economic, social and political democracy | Education for social mobility, private life, consumerism, authority and order |
| Education for participant-directed learning | Education for self-directed learning |
| Education for critical understanding | Education for skills development |
| Education for reflection | Education for diffusion of knowledge |
| Education for social responsibility | Education for autonomy |
| Learner of education | Consumer of education |
| Concern for social context | Concern for technique |



## References

Arnold, R./Burke, B. (1983a): A Popular Education Handbook. Toronto
Arnold, R./Burke, B. (1983b): Ah-Hah! A New Approach to Popular Education. Toronto
Arnold, R. et al. (1991): Educating for a Change. Toronto
Arvidsson, L. (1989): Popular Education and Educational Ideology. In: Ball, S./Larsson, S. (Eds.): The Struggle for Democratic Education. Equality and Participation in Sweden. New York/London
Beder, H. (1987): Dominant Paradigms, Adult Education and Social Justice. In: Adult Education Quarterly, No. 37 (2), 105–113
Brookfield, S. (1987): Understanding Adult Education and Training. San Francisco
Community Builders Unit (2002): Premiers Department
Crowther, J./Martin, I./Shaw, M. (Eds.) (1999): Popular Education and Social Movements in Scotland Today. Leicester
Deem, R. (1993): Popular Education for Women. A Study of Four Organizations. In: Edwards, R./Sieminski, S./Zeldin, D. (Eds.): Adult Learners. Education and Training. London
Dewey, J. (1964, first published 1916): Democracy & Education. London
Dewey, J. (1966, first published 1897): My Pedagogic Creed. In: Garforth, F. W. (Ed.): John Dewey: Selected Educational Writings. London
Fieldhouse, R. (1996): A History of Modern British Adult Education. Leicester
Garfit, A. (1862): Some Points of the Education Question. Practically Considered with Reference to the Report of the Commissioners and the New Minute. With a Brief Outline of the Rise and Progress of Popular Education in England. London

Guevara, J. R. (2002): Popular Environmental Education. Progressive Contextualisation of Local Practice in a Globalising World. PhD thesis, Victoria Institute of Technology
Heaney, T. (1996): Adult Education for Social Change. From Centre Stage to the Wings and back again. ERIC Monograph. URL: http://nlu.nl.edu/ace/Resources/Documents/ERIC1.html (last access: 16.06.09)
Hogg, G. W./Tyson, J. C. (1969): Popular Education 1700–1870. An Archive Teaching Unit for a Study of Elementary Education in the North East. University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Jeffs, T./Smith, M. (1990) (Eds.): Using Informal Education. An Alternative to Casework, Teaching and Control? Milton Keynes
Johnson, R. (1988): "Really Useful Knowledge" 1790–1850: Memories for Education in the 1980s. In: Lovett, T. (Ed.): Radical Approaches to Adult Education. London
Kotinsky, R. (1933): Adult Education and the Social Scene. New York
Lamberti, M. (2000): Radical Schoolteachers and the Origins of the Progressive Education Movement in Germany, 1900–1914. In: History of Education Quarterly, No. 40 (1), 22–48
Larsson, S. (2000): A Study Circle Democracy? Paper Presented at Second International Education and Social Action Conference December 2000. Centre for Popular Education, University of Technology, Sydney
Lindeman, E. (1926): The Meaning of Adult Education. New York
Martin, I./Rahman, H. (2001): The Politics of Really Useful Literacy. Six Lessons from Bangladesh. In: Crowther, J./Hamilton, M./Tett, L. (Eds.): Powerful Literacies. Leicester
Morris, R. (1994): Alice Henry 1857–1943. In: AAACE News. April Issue, 16–17
Morris, R. (1998): Australia's Oldest Adult Education Provider. The SMSA in the Proceedings of the 38th National Conference of the AAACE. Perth
Neuburg, V. (1971): Popular Education in Eighteenth Century England. London
Reese, W. J. (2001): The Origins of Progressive Education. In: History of Education Quarterly, No. 41 (1), 1–24
Shipp. G. (1996): The WEA after more than 80 Years. Continuity and Change. In: AAACE News, May issue
Silver, H. (1965): Concept of Popular Education. A Study of Ideas and Social Movements in the Early Nineteenth Century. London
Simon, B. (Ed.) (1972): The Radical Tradition in Education in Britain. London
Sjunnesson, J. (1998): Swedish Folk Education. Paper Presented at Föredrag vid Uppsala University International Summer session
Skeats, H. S. (1861): Popular Education in England. Being an Abstract of the Report of the Royal Commissioners on Education. London
Smith, M. K. (1994): Local Education: Community, Conversation, Praxis. Buckingham
Steele, T. (1999): With "Real Feeling and Just Sense". Rehistoricising Popular Education. In: Crowther, J./Martin, I./Shaw, M. (Eds.): Popular Education and Social Movements in Scotland Today. Leicester
Stewart, W. (1972): Progressives and Radicals in English Education 1750–1970. New Jersey
Thompson, E. P. (1968): The Making of the English Working Class. Harmondsworth
Thompson, J. (2002): Community Education and Neighbourhood Renewal. Leicester
von Kotze, A. (1996): "The Creaking of the Word". A Feminist Model? In: Walters, S. (Ed.): Gender in Popular Education: Methods for Empowerment. London
Wagner, P. A. (1998): Popular Education in the Philippines. To Make Ready to Risk. In: Popular Education Notebook, No. 4 (1), 20–22
Walters, S. (Ed.) (1996): Gender in Popular Education. Methods for Empowerment. London
Walters, S./Kruss, G. (1988): People's Education in South Africa. In: Flowers, R. (Ed.): Themes from the 1988 ILSCAE Conference. International League for Social Commitment in Adult Education. Toronto